u

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,698	01/11/2002	Kenneth L. Davis	30566.213-US-01	7955

55895	7590	09/08/2006	

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER
ALAM, UZMA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 June 2006*.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10,12-19 and 21-30* is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10,12-19 and 21-30* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
　　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to arguments filed June 12, 2006. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-30

are pending. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-30 represent distributing revision blocks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 3-10, 12-19 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Moozakis, "Ford to Share Design on Web-Carmaker salvages legacy system,"

herein referred to as "Moozakis" in view of Jones et al. US Patent No. 6,493,731

4.   Jones teaches the invention as claimed including tracking document history in metadata

format (see abstract).

5.   Moozakis teaches the invention as claimed including sharing a CAD document over the

Internet and storing collaboration data such as revision history (see full document).

6.   As per claim 1, Moozakis teaches a method for distributing design document changes

comprising:

       (a) capturing a n extensible markup language (XML) representation of a revision block

of a document wherein:

(i) the revision block documents a history of one or more changes made directly by one or more users to the design document (paragraph 4-6 and 12-14);

(ii) each row of the revision block represents one of the changes (column 4, lines 29-59; column 5, lines 10-56; column 6, lines 21-41);

(iii) each row of the revision block comprises a date for the change represented in the row (column 4, lines 29-59; column 5, lines 10-56; column 6, lines 21-41); and

(b) distributing the representation via a network service (paragraph 4-6)

Moozakis does not teach (ii) each row of the revision block represents one of the changes; and

(iii) each row of the revision block comprises a date for the change represented in the row

Jones teaches each row of the revision block represents one of the changes (column 4, lines 29-59; column 5, lines 10-56; column 6, lines 21-41);

(iii) each row of the revision block comprises a date for the change represented in the row (column 4, lines 29-59; column 5, lines 10-56; column 6, lines 21-41); and

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the rows of Jones with the revision history of Moozakis. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to document collaboration between two entities (Moozakis pp 9 and 12).

7.   As per claim 3, Moozakis teaches the method of claim 1. Moozakis does not teach wherein the revision block comprises a table of various document properties. Jones teaches

wherein the revision block comprises a table of various document properties (column 4, lines 60-67; column 6, lies 58-67; column 7, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the table of Jones with the revision history of Moozakis. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to standardize the revisions so that all users are familiar with the document (Moozakis pp 2).

8.   As per claim 4, Moozakis teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the document

properties are customized to meet documentation needs of an organization (pp 2, 4, 7).

9.   As per claim 5, Moozakis teaches the method of claim 1. Moozakis does not teach

wherein the representation is automatically captured. Jones teaches wherein the representation is

automatically captured (column 6, lines 41-56).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the capturing of Jones with the revision history of Moozakis. A person of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to work in a standard format

(Moozakis pp 2, 20).

10.   As per claim 6, Moozakis teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the representation is

captured transparently to a user (paragraph 13, 14).

11.   As per claim 7, Moozakis teaches the method of claim 1. Moozakis does not teach

wherein the representation is distributed to a consumer of the document such that the consumer

is notified of changes in the document without having to refer to the document directly. Jones

teaches wherein the representation is distributed to a consumer of the document such that the

consumer is notified of changes in the document without having to refer to the document directly

(the user can review the document in context of the resource documents; column 5, lines 1-56;

column 6, lines 1-21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to combine the notification of Jones with the revisions of Moozakis. A person of
ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this so that the user, such as a buyer,
has immediate access to any changes made to his order.

12.   As per claim 8, Moozakis teaches the method of claim 1. Moozakis does not teach
further comprising:

        updating the representation as additional revisions are added to the revision block; and

        redistributing the representation.

        ones teaches further comprising:

        updating the representation as additional revisions are added to the revision block (the
resources are updated; column 4, lines 46-60; column 12, lines 56-67; column 9, lines 31-67) and

        redistributing the representation (the resources are stored on the distributed network
environment; column 4, lines 46-60).

        It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to combine the notification of Jones with the specification of Moozakis. A person of
ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this so that the user, such as a buyer,
has immediate access to any changes made to his order.

13.   As per claim 9, Moozakis teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the distributing
comprises transmitting the representation to the network service via a network, wherein the
network service transmits the representation:

to a web site used to track revisions for a project (pp 4, pp 6);

to a database used for document management (pp 13); and

in an email to a design document consumer (pp 4).

14.   As per claim 28, Moozakis teaches the method of claim 1. Moozakis does not teach

wherein the revision block further comprises:

A revision number;

A description of each change to the design document; and

A user name for the user that made each change to the design document.

Jones teaches wherein the revision block further comprises:

A revision number (column 4, lines 29-59; column 5, lines 10-56);

A description of each change to the design document (column 4, lines 29-59; column 5,

lines 10-56); and

A user name for the user that made each change to the design document (column 4, lines 29-

59; column 5, lines 10-56).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the revisions of Jones with the revision history of Moozakis. A person of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to standardize the revisions so that.

all users are familiar with the document (Moozakis pp 2).

15.   Claims 10, 11-19 and 21-30 are rejected with the same rationale as claims 1, 3-9 and 28

because they because they disclose an apparatus and article of manufacture for the invention, but

have the same limitations as claims 1, 3-9 and 28.

Response to Arguments

16.   Applicant's arguments filed June 12, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

17.   The Office notes the following arguments:

        a.   The reference Moozakis does not teach distributing the XML representation of the

        document without transmitting the design document itself.

        b.   A components revision history can be made not have been made directly by a

        user..

        c.   Jones does not teach an XML representation of revisions of documents.

        d.   Jones does not teach any changes made to the design document.

18.   In response to:

        (a). Moozakis teaches distributing design data, such as revision history, supplier

        information and price paid, in paragraph 13 of Moozakis. The data does not necessarily

        include the whole design document.

(b) In Moozakis, suppliers and engineers are both users of a design document, so if a

supplier is making changes to a document, it is considered as if a user is making changes

to the document.

(c) Jones, in combination with Moozakis teaches revision of the document and saving

revision changes. See Jones column 4, lines 45-60. Jones does not teach that the

revisions are stored in XML format, but that is already taught by the primary Moozakis

reference. So in combination, the references teach the limitations of the claims.

(d) Jones clearly teaches making and storing changes to the document and storing this

data separately from the whole document. See Figure 3. The metadata, which stores all

the changes of the document, is stored separately from the whole document. See column

4, lines 28-32.

Conclusion

19.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uzma Alam whose telephone number is (571) 272-3995. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday 5:30 AM - 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Uzma alam
Ua
~~February 27, 2006~~
August 3, 2006

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100